

Public Meeting to Discuss HCP Conservation Strategies

November 16, 2005

DNRC Northwestern Land Office

9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Kalispell

Meeting notes transcribed here from posters in the meeting room:

Present were

DNRC: Mike O'Herron, Sarah Pierce, Brian Manning

USFWS: Tim Bodurtha, Lowell Whitney, Ben

F.H. Stoltze Land and Lumber: Paul McKenzie, Chris Damrow

Montana House Representative: Mike Jopek

Montana Senator: Greg Barkus

Trustland Program, Sonoran Institute: Diane Conradi

Public input recorded on posters:

General Comments:

- Connect HCP website more prominently to DNRC website; increase visibility and access for public input.
- Why not include wolf and eagle, with current management, for assurances under incidental take permit?
- Problem species may shift from grizzly to wolf/eagle/other.
- What happens to delisted species?
- Consider alternative in EIS to include wolf.

Grizzly Bear Strategy:

- p. 2-2, lines 14-22: What science is this strategy (security core) based on?
- Clarify firearms restriction. Is firearm carrying prohibited based on an A.R.M.? In a locked vehicle of a contractor?
- Consistently apply food storage rule with neighbors (F.Service).
- p. 3-5, lines 17-26: Clarify statement about easements "that relinquish control". What is state policy?
- Transportation planning (including easements) may have less impact on bears than simply applying standards, especially for scattered lands.
- Road management monitoring, such as counting administrative use days, may be cumbersome
- p. 3-10, line 22: At reassignment, DNRC as grantor can't restrict or change existing agreements for easements. Clarify Intent of statement.
- p. 3-11: In analysis, portray cost of alternate logging systems required to meet road system commitments.

- Black bears may result in management problems if hunting is restricted, especially for larch plantations.
- Clarify management opportunities in Zone A of Stillwater.
- p. 3-29: define “parcel” for scattered lands”
- p. 3-31: What is the funding source for expedited road closures?
- If plan makes the job easier, they are in favor of it (Stoltze).
- Show negatives versus benefits.

Lynx Strategy

- No public input

Aquatics Strategies

- Layout is operationally difficult; estimate cost in analysis.
- p. 2-7 CMZs: who defines HCP streams and necessary layout? Foresters?
- p. 2-8, item G: look at exception for fire and insects in the 25’ no cut. Consider need for insect/disease management after fire.
- Implementation requires time, money, and manpower.
- Emphasize (top-down) resource and policy commitment to implementing (e.g. it may be seen as easier to totally exclude ground from widest buffer of CMZ boundaries than to implement prescription)

Transition Lands Strategy

- Clarify process of disposal.
- p. 3-4: Loophole to prevent project or lose opportunity if consecutive 60 day delays due to letters of intent.
- Concern that process isn’t limited to exchanges etc. Could it be applied to selling timber?
- 2-year holdup to process.
- Consider bond requirement for alternative proposals to disposal.
- Clarify HCP/Transition lands relationship (management rights).
- What is/are there complication for conservation (fee simple) buyers of lands adjacent to HCP lands, in terms of forest management?
- Why are lands (Beaver Lake) out of HCP, if recreation/development aren’t covered?
- Conflict potential for lands transferring from State to private; anticipate management issues and negotiations for management across ownerships.
- Can HCP (ITP) transfer to a new owner?
- What is DNRC’s strategy for trading or blocking lands? Is it to create better HCP planning?

end